

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

ANNIE BAYLESS

v.

ST. FARM INS.

)
)
)
)
)

3-06-CV-892-R

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Upon reviewing the pleadings docketed and filed in this cause of action on May 17, 2006, consisting of nothing more than Plaintiff's name and St. Farm Ins. as defendant, on May 23, 2006, the court determined that the complaint failed to comply with the requirements of Rule 8(a), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and therefore ordered Plaintiff to file a complaint which satisfied the requirements of the rule.

In an attempt to comply with the rule, on June 28, 2006, Plaintiff submitted a narrative statement indicating that she was suing Travis Wilson Insurance Co., 702 West Moore Avenue, Suite 100, Terrell, Texas, with the second page of a letter from Tom Roberts advising that her claim was denied and her policy cancelled effective July 18, 2005, as an attachment.

The submission fails to comply with the requirements of Rule 8(a). Further, no federal jurisdiction appears since the defendant identified in the June 28, 2006, statement appears to be a citizen and resident of the State of Texas.

RECOMMENDATION:

For the foregoing reasons it is recommended that the Plaintiff's action be dismissed pursuant

to Rule 41(b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

A copy of this recommendation shall be transmitted to Plaintiff.

SIGNED this 2nd day of August, 2006.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Wm. F. Sanderson, Jr.", is written over a horizontal line.

WM. F. SANDERSON, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

NOTICE

In the event that you wish to object to this recommendation, you are hereby notified that you must file your written objections within ten (10) days after being served with a copy of this recommendation. Pursuant to Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), a party's failure to file written objections to these proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law within such ten-day period may bar a de novo determination by the district judge of any finding of fact or conclusion of law and shall bar such party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected to proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law accepted by the district court.